



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2014

Low preparedness for food allergy as perceived by school staff: a EuroPrevall survey across Europe

Le, Thuy-My ; Kummeling, Ischa ; et al

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2014.02.019>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-108677>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Le, Thuy-My; Kummeling, Ischa; et al (2014). Low preparedness for food allergy as perceived by school staff: a EuroPrevall survey across Europe. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 2(4):480-482.e1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2014.02.019>

**LOW PREPAREDNESS FOR FOOD ALLERGY AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL STAFF: A EUROPREVALL
SURVEY ACROSS EUROPE**

Thuy-My Le, MD, PhD^{1*}, Ischa Kummeling, PhD^{2*}, Danielle Dixon², Laura Barreales Tolosa,
MD³, Barbara Ballmer-Weber, MD⁴, Michael Clausen, MD⁵, M. Hazel Gowland, BA⁶, Barbara
Majkowska-Wojciechowska, MD⁷, Tihomir Mustakov, MD⁸, Nikolaos G. Papadopoulos, MD,
PhD⁹, André C. Knulst, MD, PhD¹, James Potts, MSc², Rimantas Stukas¹⁰, Peter Burney, MD,
PhD²

* Both authors contributed equally to the paper

1. University Medical Center Utrecht, Department of Dermatology/Allergology, the Netherlands

2. Department of Respiratory Epidemiology and Public Health, National Heart and Lung Institute,
Imperial College London, London, UK

3. Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Department of Preventive Medicine, Hospital Clínico San
Carlos, Madrid, Spain

4. University Hospital Zurich, Department of Dermatology, Zurich, Switzerland

5. Children's Hospital Iceland, Landspítali, University Hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland

6. Anaphylaxis Campaign UK, UK

7. Department of Immunology, Rheumatology and Allergy, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz,
Poland

8. Medical University, Clinical Centre of Allergology of the Alexandrovska Hospital, Sofia,
Bulgaria

9. Allergy Department, 2nd Pediatric Clinic, University of Athens, Athens, Greece

10. Institute of Public Health Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

Correspondence to:

Thuy-My Le

Department of Dermatology/Allergology (G02.124)

University Medical Center Utrecht

PO Box 85500

3508 GA Utrecht

The Netherlands

Email: t.t.m.le-2@umcutrecht.nl

Phone: +31 88 755 7388

Fax: +31 88 755 5404

36

37 **Funding:** This work was funded by the European Union through the EuroPrevall project (FP6-
38 FOOD-CT-2005-514000).

39

40 **Word count:** 1036

41

42 **Clinical implication:** The study shows the need for clinicians, academicians and regulatory or school
43 agencies to evaluate, establish or improve school procedures and preparedness to prevent accidental
44 ingestion and promote prompt emergency care for students with food allergy.

45

46 **Keywords:** children, epinephrine, EuroPrevall, food allergy, preparedness, schools

47

48 **Abbreviations:**

49 AAAAI = American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology

50 ASCIA = Australasian Society of Clinical Immunology and Allergy

51 *To the editor,*

52 It has been reported that 16-18% of children with food allergy experienced a reaction at school.^{1, 2}
53 According to a UK survey, 61% of schools had at least one child at risk of anaphylaxis.³ Our study
54 assessed the preparedness in dealing with symptoms of food allergy as perceived by school staff in
55 eight different countries across Europe.

56 This was a cross-sectional multicentre study that was part of the European Union funded
57 integrated project EuroPrevall.^{4, 5} One of the aims of the EuroPrevall project was to estimate the
58 prevalence of food allergy in children aged 7-10 years across Europe. For this purpose, research
59 partners from eight European cities (Athens, Greece; Lodz, Poland; Madrid, Spain; Reykjavik,
60 Iceland; Utrecht, the Netherlands; Sofia, Bulgaria; Vilnius, Lithuania; Zurich, Switzerland),
61 randomly selected primary schools from that city. The same schools took part in the survey on
62 school preparedness for food allergy, as described in this paper. For the school preparedness survey,
63 a semi-structured questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire (Box E1, online repository) was
64 administered to the most appropriate staff member in the school as advised by the head teacher, as it
65 was felt that in this international setting where some schools had health care providers on site (such
66 as school nurses), and others did not, best practice would be to let the head teacher selected the
67 person most able to answer the questions. Ethical approval for the study was, where required,
68 obtained through the appropriate committees.

69 Data analyses were based on 3 major categories of interest based on guidelines of the
70 American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology (AAAAI)⁶ and Australasian Society of
71 Clinical Immunology and Allergy Anaphylaxis Working Party (ASCIA)⁷ namely: 1) identification
72 of children with food allergy; 2) avoidance strategies creating a safe environment for children with
73 food allergy; and 3) treatment strategies educating staff about food allergy and how to recognise an
74 allergic reaction and administer epinephrine; having a written emergency treatment plan in place;
75 and having epinephrine available on site.

76 Out of 249 randomly selected schools, 190 (76%) agreed to participate. The response rates
77 ranged between 43%-100%: Madrid (43%), Reykjavik (65%), Zürich (85%), Utrecht (88%),
78 Vilnius (93%), Sofia (100%), Lodz (100%), Athens (100%). Overall, 70% of the surveys were
79 filled in by (head) teachers, 27% by health care givers (school nurse, other), 3% by other school
80 personnel. In the individual centres in each country it was almost always the same professional who
81 was the main respondent to the survey, either the teacher (Zürich, Madrid, Athens, Utrecht) or the
82 health care professional (Lodz, Sofia, Vilnius, Reykjavik).

83 The percentage of schools with staff being aware of the presence of (at least 1) food allergic
84 child/children at their school in the past 3 years ranged between 12%-100% across Europe (Table
85 E1, online repository). Athens had low awareness (12%), but the awareness of food allergy was

86 high in the other schools (72%-100%). There was a moderate awareness of what sort of symptoms
87 are associated with food allergy (Table 1). Skin symptoms were the most commonly listed (78%),
88 followed by respiratory symptoms (47%), and gastrointestinal symptoms (34%). Seventy-four
89 percent of schools stated that they identified pupils with any chronic condition or special medical
90 need in the school (Table E1, online repository).

91 To create a safe environment for food allergic children, a “no-sharing” policy in schools is
92 recommended by guidelines.⁶⁻⁸ A “no-sharing” policy referred to whether or not children were
93 prohibited from sharing or exchanging snacks or lunch with each other. Only 44% of schools had a
94 “no-sharing” policy, ranging between 0% and 91% across the different centres (Table 1).

95 Only 23% of schools had staff educated to recognise signs and symptoms of food allergy
96 (Table 1). Only in 17% of schools, members of staff were taught to read food labels for hidden
97 ingredients. Written school health guidelines were available in only 72 schools (40%) and of these
98 only 16 (22%, or 9% of all schools) included a section on food allergy. Only 26% of the schools
99 had epinephrine available in the school (Table 1) and in these schools only 53% had staff that knew
100 how to administer it. Given that in case of an acute severe food allergic reaction an injection of
101 epinephrine is the only life-saving method, we considered the reported preference for injecting
102 epinephrine in the event of a severe food allergic reaction low (11%) (Table 2).

103 Several deficits in the preparedness for food allergic reactions in the schools were revealed
104 by this survey. Not all school staff knew what sort of symptoms are associated with food allergy.
105 Very few schools had a “no-sharing” policy, had written policies including how to deal with food
106 allergy or had staff that were educated on food allergy and reading labels. There was an overall low
107 preference for injecting epinephrine in the event of a severe food allergic reaction. This is in line
108 with previous studies that showed that epinephrine is often unavailable and that staff feel
109 unconfident and often are not trained to administer it.^{9, 10} The issue on the administration of
110 epinephrine arises when there is no health personnel in schools, which is the case in the great
111 majority. Additional analyses showed that there was a pattern that schools without a health care
112 provider were less aware of food allergic children in the school, less likely to report symptoms, less
113 likely to indicate appropriate pupil identification, and less likely to have adrenaline available. This
114 indicates that in schools without health care providers, it is even more important to train the
115 teachers.

116 We acknowledge that the individual knowledge of the interviewed staff member may not
117 represent that of the whole school. However, we made all efforts to assure that the person
118 interviewed would be the person who would be most suitable to answer the questions. We did this
119 by explaining thoroughly the purpose of the study to the head teacher and let him/her select the
120 appropriate member of staff.

121 To conclude, deficits revealed by this survey warrant the preparation of guidelines for a
122 standardised approach to identifying children at risk and preventing and managing the effects of
123 food allergies. These deficits may be even more prevalent in schools without health care providers.
124 The cornerstones of management should include training of staff to improve understanding of food
125 allergy and establishing management and emergency plans in order to minimize risks and to provide
126 a safe educational environment. Our survey highlights that in many cases and in all investigated
127 countries there is room for improvement of existing practices.

128

129 *Thuy-My Le, MD, PhD^{1*}*

130 *Ischa Kummeling, PhD^{2*}*

131 *Danielle Dixon²*

132 *Laura Barreales Tolosa, MD³*

133 *Barbara Ballmer-Weber, MD⁴*

134 *Michael Clausen, MD⁵*

135 *M. Hazel Gowland, BA⁶*

136 *Barbara Majkowska-Wojciechowska, MD⁷*

137 *Tihomir Mustakov, MD⁸*

138 *Nikolaos G. Papadopoulos, MD, PhD⁹*

139 *André C. Knulst, MD, PhD¹*

140 *James Potts, MSc²*

141 *Rimantas Stukas¹⁰*

142 *Peter Burney, MD, PhD²*

143

144

145 * Both authors contributed equally to the paper

146 1. University Medical Center Utrecht, Department of Dermatology/Allergology, the Netherlands

147 2. Department of Respiratory Epidemiology and Public Health, National Heart and Lung Institute,
148 Imperial College London, London, UK

149 3. Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Department of Preventive Medicine, Hospital Clínico San
150 Carlos, Madrid, Spain

151 4. University Hospital Zurich, Department of Dermatology, Zurich, Switzerland

152 5. Children's Hospital Iceland, Landspítali, University Hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland

153 6. Anaphylaxis Campaign UK, UK

154 7. Department of Immunology, Rheumatology and Allergy, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz,
155 Poland

156 8. Medical University, Clinical Centre of Allergology of the Alexandrovska Hospital, Sofia,
157 Bulgaria
158 9. Allergy Department, 2nd Pediatric Clinic, University of Athens, Athens, Greece
159 10. Institute of Public Health Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
160

161 **Acknowledgements**

162 This work was funded by the European Union through the EuroPrevall project (FP6- FOOD-CT-
163 2005-514000). James Potts is supported by the UK Department of Health Policy Research
164 Programme.

165 We are grateful to all the principals, teachers and nurses who participated in the study. We also
166 thank the following persons for help in the conduct of the study: Marek K. Kowalski, Aleksandra
167 Wardzyńska, Marta Łuczyńska, David Gislason and Thorarinn Gislason.

168

169 **Competing interests**

170 None of the authors have competing interests to declare.

171

Reference List

1. Nowak-Wegrzyn A, Conover-Walker MK, Wood RA. Food-allergic reactions in schools and preschools. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2001;155(7):790-795.
2. Sicherer SH, Furlong TJ, DeSimone J, Sampson HA. The US Peanut and Tree Nut Allergy Registry: characteristics of reactions in schools and day care. *J Pediatr* 2001;138(4):560-565.
3. Rankin KE, Sheikh A. Serious shortcomings in the management of children with anaphylaxis in Scottish schools. *PLoS Med* 2006;3(8):e326.
4. Kummeling I, Mills EN, Clausen M et al. The EuroPrevall surveys on the prevalence of food allergies in children and adults: background and study methodology. *Allergy* 2009;64(10):1493-1497.
5. Mills EN, Mackie AR, Burney P et al. The prevalence, cost and basis of food allergy across Europe. *Allergy* 2007;62(7):717-722.
6. Anaphylaxis in schools and other childcare settings. AAAAI Board of Directors. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1998;102(2):173-176.
7. Baumgart K, Brown S, Gold M et al. ASCIA guidelines for prevention of food anaphylactic reactions in schools, preschools and child-care centres. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2004;40(12):669-671.
8. Muraro A, Clark A, Beyer K et al. The management of the allergic child at school: EAACI/GA2LEN Task Force on the allergic child at school. *Allergy* 2010;65(6):681-689.
9. Sampson HA, Mendelson L, Rosen JP. Fatal and near-fatal anaphylactic reactions to food in children and adolescents. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327(6):380-384.
10. Watura JC. Nut allergy in schoolchildren: a survey of schools in the Severn NHS Trust. *Arch Dis Child* 2002;86(4):240-244.

Table 1: Avoidance and treatment strategies

Schools	No-sharing policy			Education food allergy [*]			Education to read labels [†]			Food allergy included in written school policy [‡]			Epinephrine available on site		
	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%
Zürich	31	0	0%	32	0	0%	29	1	3%	21	2	10%	31	1	3%
Utrecht	37	16	43%	37	5	14%	37	2	5%	5	0	0%	33	4	12%
Madrid	30	13	43%	30	14	46%	28	9	32%	5	1	20%	30	6	20%
Athens	34	31	91%	34	0	0%	34	3	9%	12	0	0%	33	0	0%
Sofia	14	4	29%	16	5	31%	14	3	21%	4	3	75%	15	13	87%
Lodz	11	4	36%	12	2	17%	10	4	40%	9	0	0%	12	9	75%
Vilnius	10	4	40%	13	6	46%	11	4	36%	9	4	44%	13	4	31%
Reykjavik	12	6	50%	13	11	85%	9	4	44%	7	6	86%	11	10	91%
All schools* [†]	179	78	44%	187	43	23%	172	30	17%	72	16	22%	178	47	26%

[‡] Members of staff are educated to recognise signs and symptoms of food allergy

[†] Members of staff are taught how to read labels for hidden ingredients

^{*} Data for schools that where there is a written school policy of how to tackle severe health events (n=72)

^{||} Data missing for some schools

Table 2: Preferred plan of action if a child has a severe episode of food allergy in the school

Schools	N*	Contact parents		Contact GP [†]		Call emergency		Inject epinephrine		Wait and see		Other [‡]	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Zürich	28	16	57%	2	7%	8	29%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
Utrecht	33	3	9%	2	6%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	27	82%
Madrid	30	14	47%	2	7%	12	40%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%
Athens	34	22	65%	0	0%	12	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sofia	14	5	36%	0	0%	6	43%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%
Lodz	10	8	80%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
Vilnius	13	1	8%	0	0%	9	69%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
Reykjavik	12	2	17%	0	0%	2	17%	8	67%	0	0%	0	0%
All schools*	174	71	41%	6	3.5%	50	29%	19	11%	1	0.6%	27	16%

* Data missing for some schools

[†] General Practitioner (family doctor)

[‡] Not specified